

On Convergence of Tracking Differentiator with Multiple Stochastic Disturbances

Ze-Hao Wu, Hua-Cheng Zhou, Bao-Zhu Guo, and Feiqi Deng

Abstract—In this paper, the convergence and noise-tolerant performance of a tracking differentiator in the presence of multiple stochastic disturbances are investigated for the first time. We consider a quite general case where the input signal is corrupted by additive colored noise, and the tracking differentiator itself is disturbed by additive colored noise and white noise. It is shown that the tracking differentiator tracks the input signal and its generalized derivatives in mean square and even in almost sure sense when the stochastic noise affecting the input signal is vanishing. Some numerical simulations are performed to validate the theoretical results.

Index Terms—Tracking differentiator, convergence, noise-tolerant performance, multiple stochastic disturbances.

I. INTRODUCTION

IT is generally known that the powerful yet primitive proportional-integral-derivative (PID) control law developed during the period of the 1920s-1940s has been dominating control engineering for one century. However, the derivative control may be not practically feasible because the classical differentiation is sensitive to and may amplify the noise. A noise-tolerant tracking differentiator (TD) which is also the first part of the powerful active disturbance rejection control (ADRC) technology [1], was first proposed by Han in [2]. A detailed comparison with other differentiators aforementioned was made in [3]. The effectiveness of TD has been validated by numerous numerical experiments and engineering applications, see, for instance [4], [5], [6], [7]. The convergence of a simple linear TD was first presented in [8] with application for online estimation of the frequency of sinusoidal signals. Some convergence analyses of the nonlinear TD for both two-dimensional and high-dimensional cases under some weak assumptions were given in [9]. The weak convergence of a nonlinear TD based on finite-time stable system was presented in [10]. The more comprehensive introduction including the convergence analysis of linear, nonlinear and finite-time stable TD can be found in Chapter 2 of the monograph [11] without considering input noises. However, in practical implementations, stochastic disturbances are inevitable and the stochastic systems are modelled in many

situations, see, for instance [12], [13], [14], [15]. Motivated from this consideration, in this paper, we investigate for the first time, the convergence and noise-tolerant performance of TD when the input signal is corrupted by additive colored noise, and the TD itself is disturbed by additive colored and white noises.

The main contributions and novelty of this paper are twofold. Firstly, from a theoretical perspective, the convergence and noise-tolerant performance of TD are firstly analyzed rigorously in the presence of multiple stochastic disturbances which include both additive colored noise and white noise. Secondly, the theoretical results reveal that the states of TD track both the input signal and its generalized derivatives in mean square and even in almost sure sense in the case that the stochastic noise corrupting the input signal is vanishing.

We proceed as follows. In the next section, section II, the problem is formulated and some preliminaries are presented. In Section III, the main results are presented with proofs in Appendices. Some numerical simulations are presented in section IV, followed up concluding remarks in section V.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION AND PRELIMINARIES

The following notations are used throughout the paper. The \mathbb{R}^n denotes the n -dimensional Euclidean space; $\mathbb{E}X$ or $\mathbb{E}(X)$ denotes the mathematical expectation of a random variable X ; For a vector or matrix X , X^\top represents its transpose; $|X|$ represents the absolute value of a scalar X , and $\|X\|$ represents the Euclidean norm of a vector X ; $a \wedge b$ denotes the minimum of reals a and b .

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, P)$ be a complete filtered probability space with a filtration $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ on which three mutually independent one-dimensional standard Brownian motions $B_i(t)$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are defined. In many cases, the stochastic disturbances are modeled by white noise which is a stationary stochastic process that has zero mean and constant spectral density and is the generalized derivative of the Brownian motion (see, e.g., [16, p.51, Theorem 3.14]). Nevertheless, the white noise does not always well describe the stochastic disturbances occurring in nature because its δ -function correlation is an idealization of the correlations of real processes which often have finite, or even long, correlation time [17]. A more realistic description could be given by an exponentially correlated process, which is known as colored noise or Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process [17], [18]. Let $w_i(t)$ ($i = 1, 2$) denote the

Ze-Hao Wu is with School of Mathematics and Big Data, Foshan University, Foshan 528000, China. Email: zehaowu@amss.ac.cn

Hua-Cheng Zhou is with School of Mathematics and Statistics, Central South University, Changsha 410075, China. Email: hczhou@amss.ac.cn

Bao-Zhu Guo is with Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China. Email: bzguo@iss.ac.cn

Feiqi Deng is with Systems Engineering Institute, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou 510640, China. Email: aufqdeng@scut.edu.cn

colored noise. They are the solutions of the Itô-type stochastic differential equations (see, e.g., [17, p.426], [19, p.101]):

$$dw_i(t) = -\alpha_i w_i(t)dt + \alpha_i \sqrt{2\beta_i} dB_i(t), \quad (1)$$

where $\alpha_i > 0$ and β_i are given constants describing the correlation time and the noise intensity, respectively, and the initial values $w_i(0) \in L^2(\Omega; \mathbb{R})$ are independent of $B_i(t)$. In other words, the parameters α_i describe the bandwidth of the noise, while β_i denote its spectral height, and the correlation functions of the processes $w_i(t)$ are more realistic exponential functions yet not the δ -ones (see, e.g., [17]). In what follows, α_i and β_i can be unknown constants.

Let $v(t)$ be a time-varying input signal which is supposed to be contaminated by additive colored noise. Therefore, the input signal is actually

$$v^*(t) := v(t) + \sigma_1 w_1(t), \quad (2)$$

where σ_1 is a constant that could be unknown and represents the intensity of the colored noise. In addition, we consider a general case where the system constructing TD is disturbed by both additive colored noise and white noise as follows:

$$\begin{cases} dx_1(t) = x_2(t)dt, \\ dx_2(t) = x_3(t)dt, \\ \vdots \\ dx_{n-1}(t) = x_n(t)dt, \\ dx_n(t) = r^n f(x_1(t) - v^*(t), \frac{x_2(t)}{r}, \dots, \frac{x_n(t)}{r^{n-1}})dt \\ \quad + \sigma_2 w_2(t)dt + \sigma_3 dB_3(t), \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where $r > 0$ is a tuning parameter, $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an appropriate known function chosen to satisfy the following Assumption (A1), and “ $\sigma_2 w_2(t) + \sigma_3 \dot{B}_3(t)$ ” represents the multiple stochastic disturbances with σ_i ($i = 2, 3$) being constants that could be unknown and $\dot{B}_3(t)$ being the white noise which is the formal derivative of the Brownian motion. Han’s TD in [2] is a special case of (3) with $\sigma_i = 0, i = 1, 2, 3$. The consideration of such a TD is based on three aspects: First, such a TD itself in noisy environment is quite general whereas the TD without any noise corruption is just a special case of $\sigma_2 = \sigma_3 = 0$. Second, the quantization errors caused by the digital implementation of TD always exist and can be regarded as a kind of process noise. Finally, TD is the first part of the powerful ADRC which has been hardwired into the general purpose control chips made by industry giants such as Texas Instruments [20], where the hardware might work in noisy environment.

In addition, it should be noticed that the solution of (3) depends on the tuning parameter r . Hereafter, we always drop r from solutions by abuse of notation without confusion.

The following Assumption (A1) is a prior assumption about the known function $f(\cdot)$ chosen in constructing TD (3).

Assumption (A1). The $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a locally Lipschitz continuous function with respect to its arguments, $f(0, \dots, 0) = 0$, and there exist known constants $\lambda_i > 0$ ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$) and a twice continuously differentiable function $V : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ which is positive definite and radially unbounded such that

$$\lambda_1 \|z\|^2 \leq V(z) \leq \lambda_2 \|z\|^2, \quad \lambda_3 \|z\|^2 \leq W(z) \leq \lambda_4 \|z\|^2,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{\partial V(z)}{\partial z_i} z_{i+1} + \frac{\partial V(z)}{\partial z_n} f(z) &\leq -W(z), \\ \left| \frac{\partial V(z)}{\partial z_j} \right| &\leq c_1 \|z\|, \quad \left| \frac{\partial^2 V(z)}{\partial z_j^2} \right| \leq c_2, \\ \forall z = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) &\in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad j = 1, n, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

for some nonnegative continuous function $W : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and some constants $c_i > 0$ ($i = 1, 2$).

Remark II.1. Generally speaking, the Assumption (A1) guarantees that the function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is chosen so that the zero equilibrium state of the following system

$$\dot{z}(t) = (z_2(t), z_3(t), \dots, f(z(t))) \quad (5)$$

is globally exponentially stable with $z = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$. It is easy to verify that the simplest example to satisfy Assumption (A1) is the linear function

$$f(z) = a_1 z_1 + \dots + a_n z_n, \quad (6)$$

where the parameters a_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$) are chosen such that the matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & 1 \\ a_1 & a_2 & \dots & a_{n-1} & a_n \end{pmatrix}_{n \times n} \quad (7)$$

is Hurwitz. The TD with linear function $f(\cdot)$ given by (6) is referred as linear TD in what follows.

The solution of (1) can be explicitly expressed as

$$w_i(t) = e^{-\alpha_i t} w_i(0) + \int_0^t e^{-\alpha_i(t-s)} \alpha_i \sqrt{2\beta_i} dB_i(s). \quad (8)$$

Define

$$\gamma_i = \mathbb{E}|w_i(0)|^2 + \alpha_i \beta_i, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (9)$$

By the Itô isometric formula, it is easy to verify that the second moments of $w_i(t)$ ($i = 1, 2$) are bounded:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|w_i(t)|^2 &= e^{-2\alpha_i t} \mathbb{E}|w_i(0)|^2 + \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^t e^{-\alpha_i(t-s)} \alpha_i \sqrt{2\beta_i} dB_i(s) \right|^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}|w_i(0)|^2 + 2\alpha_i^2 \beta_i \int_0^t e^{-2\alpha_i(t-s)} ds \\ &\leq \gamma_i, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

This is the reason behind that the TD may be feasible when the input signal is disturbed by additive colored noise.

III. MAIN RESULTS

Set $\hat{B}_1(t) = \sqrt{r} B_1(\frac{t}{r})$, $\hat{B}_3(t) = \sqrt{r} B_3(\frac{t}{r})$. Notice that for any $r > 0$, $\hat{B}_1(t)$ and $\hat{B}_3(t)$ are still mutually independent one-dimensional standard Brownian motions. By definition of $v^*(t)$ in (2), it follows that

$$dv^*(t) = \dot{v}(t)dt - \sigma_1 \alpha_1 w_1(t)dt + \sigma_1 \alpha_1 \sqrt{2\beta_1} dB_1(t), \quad (11)$$

and then

$$dv^*\left(\frac{t}{r}\right) = \dot{v}\left(\frac{t}{r}\right)dt - \frac{\sigma_1 \alpha_1}{r} w_1\left(\frac{t}{r}\right)dt + \frac{\sigma_1 \alpha_1 \sqrt{2\beta_1}}{\sqrt{r}} d\hat{B}_1(t), \quad (12)$$

where $\dot{v}(\frac{t}{r})$ denotes, in what follows, the derivative of $v(\frac{t}{r})$ with respect to the time t . For $i = 2, \dots, n$, set

$$y_1(t) = x_1\left(\frac{t}{r}\right) - v^*\left(\frac{t}{r}\right), \quad y_i(t) = \frac{1}{r^{i-1}}x_i\left(\frac{t}{r}\right). \quad (13)$$

A direct computation shows that $y(t) = (y_1(t), \dots, y_n(t))$ satisfies the following Itô-type stochastic differential equation:

$$\begin{cases} dy_1(t) = y_2(t)dt - \dot{v}\left(\frac{t}{r}\right)dt + \frac{\sigma_1\alpha_1}{r}w_1\left(\frac{t}{r}\right)dt \\ \quad - \frac{\sigma_1\alpha_1\sqrt{2\beta_1}}{\sqrt{r}}d\hat{B}_1(t), \\ dy_2(t) = y_3(t)dt, \\ \quad \vdots \\ dy_{n-1}(t) = y_n(t)dt, \\ dy_n(t) = f(y(t))dt + \frac{\sigma_2}{r^n}w_2\left(\frac{t}{r}\right)dt + \frac{\sigma_3}{r^{n-\frac{1}{2}}}d\hat{B}_3(t). \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

We first introduce Lemma III.1 below to present the existence and uniqueness of the global solution to system (14) and give an estimate of the second moment of the global solution.

Lemma III.1. *Suppose that $v : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuously differentiable function satisfying $\sup_{t \geq 0} (|v(t)| + |\dot{v}(t)|) \leq M$ for some constant $M > 0$ and Assumption (A1) holds, and the tuning parameter r is chosen so that $r \geq 1$. Then, for any initial value $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, system (14) admits a unique global solution which satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \|y(s)\|^2 \right) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \left(N_1 + \frac{N_2}{N_3} \right) e^{N_3 t}, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \quad (15)$$

where the constants $N_i (i = 1, 2, 3)$ are specified in (35).

Proof. See ‘‘Proof of Lemma III.1’’ in Appendix A. \square

In what follows, a value range of the tuning parameter to guarantee the convergence of TD (3) can be specified as

$$R_0 := \left\{ r \geq 1 : \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{2r^{2n-1}} \leq \frac{\theta\lambda_3}{\lambda_2} \right\}, \quad (16)$$

where $\theta \in (0, 1)$ is any chosen parameter. Note that when $\theta \in (0, 1)$ is increasing, the range R_0 will increase as well but the exponential decay rate $\frac{(1-\theta)\lambda_3}{\lambda_2}$ associated with the tracking error would be reduced.

The convergence result of TD (3) in the presence of multiple stochastic disturbances is summarized as the following Theorem III.1.

Theorem III.1. *Suppose that $v : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuously differentiable function satisfying $\sup_{t \geq 0} (|v(t)| + |\dot{v}(t)|) \leq M$ for some constant $M > 0$ and Assumption (A1) holds. Then, for any tuning parameter $r \in R_0$, initial value $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $T > 0$, the TD (3) admits a unique global solution satisfying*

$$(i) \quad \mathbb{E}|x_1(t) - v(t)|^2 \leq \frac{(1 + \frac{1}{\mu})\Gamma}{r} + (1 + \mu)\sigma_1^2\gamma_1 \quad (17)$$

uniformly in $t \in [T, \infty)$, where μ is any positive constant and Γ specified in (46) is a positive constant independent of r ;

$$(ii) \quad \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|x_1(t) - v(t)|^2 \leq \sigma_1^2\gamma_1 \quad (18)$$

uniformly in $t \in [T, \infty)$;

$$(iii) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} |x_1(t) - v(t)| = 0 \text{ almost surely} \quad (19)$$

uniformly in $t \in [T, \infty)$ when $\sigma_1 = 0$.

Proof. See ‘‘Proof of Theorem III.1’’ in Appendix B. \square

Remark III.1. *Note that the tracking error system (14) is an Itô-type stochastic system. Thus, the convergence in mean square sense is natural because the Itô integral terms are zero as martingales after taking mathematical expectation. In addition, the mean square sense denotes the convergence of an average level of the tracking error, which could be in line with engineering applications since the deviation of every sample path of the tracking error from the average level is often small. Finally, we can see from (17) that the upper bound of the tracking error in mean square can approach $\sigma_1^2\gamma_1$ arbitrarily and quickly by tuning the parameter r to be sufficiently large since the convergence time T is any positive constant. This is what we mean by ‘‘TD is not sensitive to input noise’’. It seems impossible to make the tracking error as small as possible when $\sigma_1 \neq 0$ in (2).*

Remark III.2. *It is noteworthy that the selection of the function $f(\cdot)$ guarantees that the ‘‘nominal part’’ of the tracking error system (14) defined in (5) is exponentially stable with the decay rate $\frac{\lambda_3}{\lambda_2}$ which depends on $f(\cdot)$. By definition of Γ from (46) in Appendix B, the constant Γ which is a part of the tracking error (depending on $f(\cdot)$) becomes smaller if the decay rate $\frac{\lambda_3}{\lambda_2}$ becomes larger. In addition, another advantage could be mentioned is that when the decay rate $\frac{\lambda_3}{\lambda_2}$ becomes larger, the value range of the tuning parameter r defined in (16) will increase.*

Finally, we indicate an important fact that $x_i(t)$ ($i = 2, 3, \dots, n$) can always be regarded as an approximation of the corresponding $(i - 1)$ -th derivative of $v(t)$ in terms of generalized derivative whatever the classical derivatives of $v(t)$ exist or not. In fact, for any $a > 0$, let $C_0^\infty(0, a)$ be the set that contains all infinitely differentiable functions with compact support on $(0, a)$. Remember that for any locally integrable function $h : (0, a) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the usual $(i - 1)$ -th generalized derivative of h , still denoted by $h^{(i-1)}$, always exists in the sense of distribution defined as a functional on $C_0^\infty(0, a)$ that

$$h^{(i-1)}(\varphi) = (-1)^{i-1} \int_0^a h(t)\varphi^{(i-1)}(t)dt, \quad (20)$$

for every test function $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(0, a)$ and $2 \leq i \leq n$ (see, e.g., [11, p.43]). In addition, a generalized stochastic process Φ is simply a random generalized function in the following sense: For every test function $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(0, a)$, a random variable $\Phi(\varphi)$ is assigned such that the functional Φ on $C_0^\infty(0, a)$ is linear and continuous (see, e.g., [16, p.50]). Thus, for each $i = 2, 3, \dots, n$, x_i itself can be regarded as a generalized stochastic process in the sense that

$$x_i(\varphi) = \int_0^a x_i(t)\varphi(t)dt, \quad \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(0, a). \quad (21)$$

For each $i = 2, 3, \dots, n$, the state x_i of the TD (3) is convergent to the $(i-1)$ -th generalized derivative of the input signal v in mean square and almost sure sense, which is summarized in the following Theorem III.2.

Theorem III.2. *Suppose that $v : [0, a] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuously differentiable and Assumption (A1) holds. Then, for any initial value $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the TD (3) admits a unique global solution, and for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(0, a)$ and all $i = 2, 3, \dots, n$, there holds*

$$(i) \quad \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|x_i(\varphi) - v^{(i-1)}(\varphi)|^2 \leq a^2 \sup_{t \in (0, a)} |\varphi^{(i-1)}(t)|^2 \sigma_1^2 \gamma_1; \quad (22)$$

$$(ii) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} |x_i(\varphi) - v^{(i-1)}(\varphi)| = 0 \text{ almost surely} \quad (23)$$

when the additive colored noise affecting the input signal is vanishing, i.e., $\sigma_1 = 0$.

Proof. See ‘‘ Proof of Theorem III.2’’ in Appendix C. \square

Remark III.3. *The convergence of linear TD without requiring Assumption (A1) can be concluded directly from Theorems III.1 and III.2. This is because the matrix A in (7) defined by the designed parameters a_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$) is Hurwitz so that there exists a unique positive definite matrix solution Q to the Lyapunov equation $QA + A^T Q = -I_{n \times n}$ for n -dimensional identity matrix $I_{n \times n}$. For this reason, we can define the Lyapunov functions $V : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and $W : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ by $V(z) = zQz^T$ and $W(z) = \|z\|^2$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, respectively. It is then easy to verify that all conditions in Assumption (A1) are satisfied, where the parameters in Assumptions (A1) are specified as $\lambda_1 = \lambda_{\min}(Q)$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda_{\max}(Q)$, $\lambda_3 = \lambda_4 = 1$, $c_1 = c_2 = 2\lambda_{\max}(Q)$, with $\lambda_{\min}(Q)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(Q)$ being respectively the minimal and maximal eigenvalues of the matrix Q .*

Remark III.4. *The present paper focuses only on the convergence and noise-tolerant performance for TD in the presence of multiple stochastic disturbances. However, in practical applications, there may exist phase lags because of using the integration of TD to estimate the derivatives of the input signal, which can be overcome by introducing feedforward in the design of TD ([15]).*

IV. NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

In this section, some numerical simulations are presented to verify the effectiveness of the main results. Let the input signal be $v(t) = \sin(3t + 1)$. We design a second-order linear TD and a second-order nonlinear TD in the form of (3) in the presence of multiple stochastic disturbances. The linear TD is produced by a linear function given by

$$f(z_1, z_2) = -2z_1 - 4z_2, \quad \forall (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2. \quad (24)$$

Motivated by the nonlinear feedback controller design, a nonlinear function used for the construction of nonlinear TD can

be the linear function (24) adding with a Lipschitz continuous function given by

$$f(z_1, z_2) = -2z_1 - 4z_2 - \phi(z_1), \quad \forall (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad (25)$$

where

$$\phi(s) = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{4\pi}, & s \in (-\infty, -\frac{\pi}{2}), \\ \frac{1}{4\pi} \sin s, & s \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}], \\ \frac{1}{4\pi}, & s \in (\frac{\pi}{2}, +\infty), \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

and the Assumption (A1) holds for ([11, p.196])

$$\begin{aligned} V(z_1, z_2) &= 1.375z_1^2 + 0.1875z_2^2 + 0.5z_1z_2, \\ W(z_1, z_2) &= 0.5z_1^2 + 0.5z_2^2, \lambda_1 = 0.13, \lambda_2 = 1.43, \\ \lambda_3 = \lambda_4 &= 0.5, c_1 = 3.91, c_2 = 2.75. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

In Figures 1-3, some relative parameters are chosen as

$$\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 3, \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \frac{1}{18}, \sigma_1 = 0.2, \sigma_2 = \sigma_3 = 2, \quad (28)$$

the initial values are taken as



$$x_1(0) = \sin(1), x_2(0) = 0, w_1(0) = 1, w_2(0) = -1, \quad (29)$$

the sampling period $\Delta t = 0.001$, and the diffusion terms $dB_i(t)$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are simulated by $\sqrt{\Delta t}$ multiplied by random sequences generated by the Matlab program command ‘‘randn’’. The selection of r can be specified by (16). In Figures 1-2 and 3, we choose $r = 30$ and $r = 15$, respectively, and it can be easily verified for the nonlinear case that if $r = 15$, $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{2r^{2n-1}} = \frac{1}{15} + \frac{1}{2 \times 15^3} \approx 0.07 < \frac{\theta \lambda_2}{\lambda_1} \approx 0.17$, i.e., $r = 15 \in R_0$ and then $r = 30 \in R_0$, where we set $\theta = 0.5$.

It is seen from Figure 1 that the states $x_1(t)$ and $x_2(t)$ of the linear TD track quickly the input signal $v(t) = \sin(3t + 1)$ and the derivative of the input signal, respectively. It is also observed from Figure 2 that the tracking effect of the nonlinear TD is at least as good as the linear TD. These are consistent with the theoretical result that the tracking error becomes small after any given time $T > 0$ with the choice of an appropriate tuning parameter r . Since in Figure 3 the tuning parameter r is reduced to be $r = 15$, it can be seen that the tracking accuracy of the nonlinear TD is relatively not as good as Figure 2, which is consistent with the theoretical result that the upper bound of the tracking error is inverse proportional to the tuning parameter r . In addition, it can be observed that the peaking value phenomenon does not exist in Figures 1-3.

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The convergence and noise-tolerant performance of a tracking differentiator (TD) are investigated, where a general case is considered that the input signal and the TD itself are disturbed by additive colored noise and additive colored and white noises, respectively. The mathematical proofs are presented to show that the tracking errors of the states of TD to the input signal and its generalized derivatives are convergent in mean square and even in almost sure sense for the special vanishing input noise. Some numerical simulations are presented to demonstrate the validity of the proposed TD. Finally, it is

Fig. 1. The tracking effect of linear TD with $r = 30$.Fig. 2. The tracking effect of nonlinear TD with $r = 30$.

worth mentioning that the noise intensity maximum tolerance analysis of TD would be a potential interesting problem to be further investigated in the future study.

APPENDIX A: Proof of Lemma III.1

By (1), $w_i(t)$ ($i = 1, 2$) can be regarded as the augmented state variables of system (14). Since the function $f(\cdot)$ satisfies the local Lipschitz condition, it follows from the existence-and-unique theorem for Itô-type stochastic systems (see, e.g., [19, p.58, Theorem 3.6]) that there exist a unique maximal local solution $y(t)$ over $t \in [0, \tau)$ where τ is the explosion time. To show that $y(t)$ is a global solution, we only need to show $\tau = \infty$ almost surely. For every integer $m \geq 1$, define the stopping time $\tau_m = \tau \wedge \inf\{t : 0 \leq t < \tau, \|y(t)\| \geq m\}$, and set $\inf \emptyset = \infty$. Since $\{t : 0 \leq t < \tau, \|y(t)\| \geq m+1\} \subset \{t : 0 \leq t < \tau, \|y(t)\| \geq m\}$, we have $\tau_m \uparrow \tau$ almost surely as $m \rightarrow \infty$. By the Itô's formula, it yields

$$\begin{aligned} V(y(t)) &= V(y(0)) \\ &+ \int_0^t \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{\partial V(y(s))}{\partial y_i} y_{i+1}(s) + \frac{\partial V(y(s))}{\partial y_n} f(y(s)) \right] ds \\ &+ \int_0^t \left[\frac{\partial V(y(s))}{\partial y_1} \left(-\frac{1}{r} \frac{dw_1(s)}{ds} \Big|_{u=\frac{s}{r}} + \frac{\sigma_1 \alpha_1}{r} w_1\left(\frac{s}{r}\right) \right) \right] ds \\ &+ \frac{\sigma_1^2 \alpha_1^2 \beta_1}{r} \int_0^t \frac{\partial^2 V(y(s))}{\partial y_1^2} ds + \frac{\sigma_2}{r^n} \int_0^t \frac{\partial V(y(s))}{\partial y_n} w_2\left(\frac{s}{r}\right) ds \\ &+ \frac{\sigma_3^2}{2r^{2n-1}} \int_0^t \frac{\partial^2 V(y(s))}{\partial y_n^2} ds - \int_0^t \frac{\sigma_1 \alpha_1 \sqrt{2\beta_1}}{\sqrt{r}} \frac{\partial V(y(s))}{\partial y_1} d\hat{B}_1(s) \end{aligned}$$

$$+ \int_0^t \frac{\sigma_3}{r^{n-\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\partial V(y(s))}{\partial y_n} d\hat{B}_3(s). \quad (30)$$

Thus, it follows from Assumption (A1), (10) and Young's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq u \leq t} V(y(u \wedge \tau_m)) \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} V(y(0)) + \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq u \leq t} \int_0^{u \wedge \tau_m} \left[\frac{1}{2\lambda_1 r} V(y(s)) + \frac{c_1^2 M^2}{2r} \right. \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\lambda_1 r} V(y(s)) + \frac{c_1^2 \sigma_1^2 \alpha_1^2}{2r} |w_1\left(\frac{s}{r}\right)|^2 + \frac{c_2 \sigma_1^2 \alpha_1^2 \beta_1}{2r^{2n-1}} \\ &+ \left. \frac{1}{2\lambda_1 r^n} V(y(s)) + \frac{c_1^2 \sigma_2^2}{2r^n} |w_2\left(\frac{s}{r}\right)|^2 + \frac{c_2 \sigma_3^2}{2r^{2n-1}} \right] ds \\ &+ \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq u \leq t} \int_0^{u \wedge \tau_m} -\frac{\sigma_1 \alpha_1 \sqrt{2\beta_1}}{\sqrt{r}} \frac{\partial V(y(s))}{\partial y_1} d\hat{B}_1(s) \right) \\ &+ \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq u \leq t} \int_0^{u \wedge \tau_m} \frac{\sigma_3}{r^{n-\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\partial V(y(s))}{\partial y_n} d\hat{B}_3(s) \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} V(y(0)) + \int_0^t \left[\frac{c_1^2 M^2}{2r} + \frac{c_1^2 \sigma_1^2 \alpha_1^2 \gamma_1}{2r} + \frac{c_2 \sigma_1^2 \alpha_1^2 \beta_1}{r} \right. \\ &+ \left. \frac{c_1^2 \sigma_2^2 \gamma_2}{2r^n} + \frac{c_2 \sigma_3^2}{2r^{2n-1}} + \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_1 r} + \frac{1}{2\lambda_1 r^n} \right) \mathbb{E} V(y(s \wedge \tau_m)) \right] ds \\ &+ \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq u \leq t} \int_0^{u \wedge \tau_m} -\frac{\sigma_1 \alpha_1 \sqrt{2\beta_1}}{\sqrt{r}} \frac{\partial V(y(s))}{\partial y_1} d\hat{B}_1(s) \right) \\ &+ \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq u \leq t} \int_0^{u \wedge \tau_m} \frac{\sigma_3}{r^{n-\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\partial V(y(s))}{\partial y_n} d\hat{B}_3(s) \right). \quad (31) \end{aligned}$$

By Assumption (A1), $\int_0^{t \wedge \tau_m} -\frac{\sigma_1 \alpha_1 \sqrt{2\beta_1}}{\sqrt{r}} \frac{\partial V(y(s))}{\partial y_1} d\hat{B}_1(s)$ is a




Fig. 3. The tracking effect of nonlinear TD with $r = 15$.

martingale on $t \geq 0$, and so is for $\int_0^{t \wedge \tau_m} \frac{\sigma_3}{r^{n-\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\partial V(y(s))}{\partial y_n} d\hat{B}_3(s)$. By the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality ([19, Theorem 1.7.3]),

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq u \leq t} \int_0^{u \wedge \tau_m} -\frac{\sigma_1 \alpha_1 \sqrt{2\beta_1}}{\sqrt{r}} \frac{\partial V(y(s))}{\partial y_1} d\hat{B}_1(s) \right) \\ & \leq 4\sqrt{2} \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^t \left| \frac{\sigma_1 \alpha_1 \sqrt{2\beta_1}}{\sqrt{r}} \frac{\partial V(y(s \wedge \tau_m))}{\partial y_1} \right|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq \frac{16c_1^2 \sigma_1^2 \alpha_1^2 \beta_1}{r} + \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} V(y(s \wedge \tau_m)) ds, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq u \leq t} \int_0^{u \wedge \tau_m} \frac{\sigma_3}{r^{n-\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\partial V(y(s))}{\partial y_n} d\hat{B}_3(s) \right) \\ & \leq \frac{4\sqrt{2}\sigma_3}{r^{n-\frac{1}{2}}} \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^t \left| \frac{\partial V(y(s \wedge \tau_m))}{\partial y_n} \right|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq \frac{4\sqrt{2}\sigma_3 c_1}{r^{n-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\lambda_1}} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} V(y(s \wedge \tau_m)) \int_0^t 1 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} V(y(s \wedge \tau_m)) \right) + \int_0^t \frac{16c_1^2 \sigma_3^2}{r^{2n-1} \lambda_1} ds. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Combining (31), (32) and (33), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} V(y(s \wedge \tau_m)) \right) \\ & \leq N_1 + \int_0^t (N_2 + N_3 \mathbb{E} V(y(s \wedge \tau_m))) ds \end{aligned}$$

$$= N_1 + N_3 \int_0^t \left(\frac{N_2}{N_3} + \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq u \leq s} V(y(u \wedge \tau_m)) \right) ds, \quad (34)$$

where we set

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 &= 2\mathbb{E} V(y(0)) + \frac{32c_1^2 \sigma_1^2 \alpha_1^2 \beta_1}{r}, \\ N_2 &= \frac{c_1^2 M^2}{r} + \frac{c_1^2 \sigma_1^2 \alpha_1^2 \gamma_1}{r} + \frac{2c_2 \sigma_1^2 \alpha_1^2 \beta_1}{r} + \frac{c_1^2 \sigma_2^2 \gamma_2}{r^n} \\ & \quad + \frac{c_2 \sigma_3^2}{r^{2n-1}} + \frac{32c_1^2 \sigma_3^2}{r^{2n-1} \lambda_1}, \\ N_3 &= \frac{2}{\lambda_1 r} + \frac{1}{\lambda_1 r^n} + \frac{2}{\lambda_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Now, applying Gronwall's inequality ([19, Theorem 1.8.1]) yields

$$\frac{N_2}{N_3} + \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} V(y(s \wedge \tau_m)) \right) \leq \left(N_1 + \frac{N_2}{N_3} \right) e^{N_3 t}. \quad (36)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t \wedge \tau_m} \|y(s)\|^2 \right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t \wedge \tau_m} V(y(s)) \right) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \left(N_1 + \frac{N_2}{N_3} \right) e^{N_3 t}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

This implies that

$$m^2 P\{\tau_m \leq t\} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \left(N_1 + \frac{N_2}{N_3} \right) e^{N_3 t}. \quad (38)$$

Passing to the limit as $m \rightarrow \infty$ gives $P\{\tau \leq t\} = 0$ which yields in turn $P\{\tau > t\} = 1$. Since $t \geq 0$ is arbitrary, we then have $\tau = \infty$ almost surely, and $y(t)$ exists globally. Furthermore, passing to the limit as $m \rightarrow \infty$ for (37) again gives (15) from Fatou's Lemma. This completes the proof of the Lemma III.1.

APPENDIX B: Proof of Theorem III.1

It follows from Lemma III.1 that the TD (3) admits a unique global solution and $\int_0^t \frac{\sigma_1 \alpha_1 \sqrt{2\beta_1}}{\sqrt{r}} \frac{\partial V(y(s))}{\partial y_1} d\hat{B}_1(s)$ is a martingale on $t \geq 0$, and so is for $\int_0^t \frac{\sigma_3}{r^{n-\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\partial V(y(s))}{\partial y_n} d\hat{B}_3(s)$. Thus, for all $t \geq 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \frac{\sigma_1 \alpha_1 \sqrt{2\beta_1}}{\sqrt{r}} \frac{\partial V(y(s))}{\partial y_1} d\hat{B}_1(s) = 0, \\ & \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \frac{\sigma_3}{r^{n-\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\partial V(y(s))}{\partial y_n} d\hat{B}_3(s) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Finding the derivative of $\mathbb{E} V(y(t))$ with respect to t , it follows from Assumption (A1), (10), (30), (39), $r \in \mathbb{R}_0$ and Young's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d\mathbb{E} V(y(t))}{dt} \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{\partial V(y(t))}{\partial y_i} y_{i+1}(t) + \frac{\partial V(y(t))}{\partial y_n} f(y(t)) \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\partial V(y(t))}{\partial y_1} \left(-\frac{1}{r} \frac{dv(u)}{du} \Big|_{u=\frac{t}{r}} + \frac{\sigma_1 \alpha_1}{r} w_1 \left(\frac{t}{r} \right) \right) \right) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\sigma_1^2 \alpha_1^2 \beta_1}{r} \frac{\partial^2 V(y(t))}{\partial y_1^2} + \frac{\sigma_2}{r^n} \frac{\partial V(y(t))}{\partial y_n} w_2 \left(\frac{t}{r} \right) \right) \\ & \quad + \frac{\sigma_3^2}{2r^{2n-1}} \mathbb{E} \frac{\partial^2 V(y(t))}{\partial y_n^2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq -\mathbb{E}W(y(t)) + \frac{\lambda_1}{2r} \mathbb{E}\|y(t)\|^2 + \frac{c_1^2 M^2}{2\lambda_1 r} + \frac{\lambda_1}{2r} \mathbb{E}\|y(t)\|^2 \\
&+ \frac{c_1^2 \sigma_1^2 \alpha_1^2}{2\lambda_1 r} \mathbb{E}|w_1(\frac{t}{r})|^2 + \frac{c_2 \sigma_1^2 \alpha_1^2 \beta_1}{r} + \frac{\lambda_1}{2r^{2n-1}} \mathbb{E}\|y(t)\|^2 \\
&+ \frac{c_1^2 \sigma_2^2}{2\lambda_1 r} \mathbb{E}|w_2(\frac{t}{r})|^2 + \frac{c_2 \sigma_3^2}{2r^{2n-1}} \\
&\leq -\frac{\lambda_3}{\lambda_2} \mathbb{E}V(y(t)) + \frac{1}{2r} \mathbb{E}V(y(t)) + \frac{c_1^2 M^2}{2\lambda_1 r} \\
&+ \frac{1}{2r} \mathbb{E}V(y(t)) + \frac{c_1^2 \sigma_1^2 \alpha_1^2 \gamma_1}{2\lambda_1 r} + \frac{c_2 \sigma_1^2 \alpha_1^2 \beta_1}{r} \\
&+ \frac{1}{2r^{2n-1}} \mathbb{E}V(y(t)) + \frac{c_1^2 \sigma_2^2 \gamma_2}{2\lambda_1 r} + \frac{c_2 \sigma_3^2}{2r^{2n-1}} \\
&\leq -\frac{(1-\theta)\lambda_3}{\lambda_2} \mathbb{E}V(y(t)) + \frac{\Gamma_1}{r}, \tag{40}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_1 &:= \frac{c_1^2 M^2}{2\lambda_1} + \frac{c_1^2 \sigma_1^2 \alpha_1^2 \gamma_1}{2\lambda_1} + c_2 \sigma_1^2 \alpha_1^2 \beta_1 \\
&+ \frac{c_1^2 \sigma_2^2 \gamma_2}{2\lambda_1} + \frac{c_2 \sigma_3^2}{2}, \tag{41}
\end{aligned}$$

and $\theta \in (0, 1)$ is given in (16). This, together with Assumption (A1), yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}V(y(t)) \\
&\leq e^{-\frac{(1-\theta)\lambda_3}{\lambda_2} t} \mathbb{E}V(y(0)) + \frac{\Gamma_1}{r} \int_0^t e^{-\frac{(1-\theta)\lambda_3}{\lambda_2} (t-s)} ds \\
&\leq \lambda_2 e^{-\frac{(1-\theta)\lambda_3}{\lambda_2} t} \mathbb{E}\|y(0)\|^2 + \frac{\lambda_2 \Gamma_1}{\lambda_3 (1-\theta) r}. \tag{42}
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\|y(0)\|^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}|x_1(0) - v(0) - \sigma_1 w_1(0)|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{r^{2i}} |x_{i+1}(0)|^2, \tag{43}
\end{aligned}$$

it can be concluded that for any $T > 0$, there exists a positive constant

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_2 &:= \sup_{\substack{r \in R_0 \\ n-1}} (e^{-\frac{(1-\theta)\lambda_3}{\lambda_2} rT} r) \cdot [\mathbb{E}|x_1(0) - v(0) - \sigma_1 w_1(0)|^2 \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |x_{i+1}(0)|^2] \tag{44}
\end{aligned}$$

which is independent of r . This is because $g(r) := e^{-\frac{(1-\theta)\lambda_3}{\lambda_2} rT} r$ is continuous with respect to r . Since $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} g(r) = 0$, $g(r)$ is bounded on the domain R_0 , i.e., there is a positive constant N independent of r such that $N = \sup_{r \in R_0} (e^{-\frac{(1-\theta)\lambda_3}{\lambda_2} rT} r)$. Hence, Γ_2 is independent of r and so $e^{-\frac{(1-\theta)\lambda_3}{\lambda_2} rT} \mathbb{E}\|y(0)\|^2 \leq \frac{\Gamma_2}{r}$. Therefore, for all $t \in [T, \infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}|x_1(t) - v^*(t)|^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}|y_1(rt)|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\|y(rt)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \mathbb{E}V(y(rt)) \\
&\leq \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} e^{-\frac{(1-\theta)\lambda_3}{\lambda_2} rT} \mathbb{E}\|y(0)\|^2 + \frac{\lambda_2 \Gamma_1}{\lambda_3 (1-\theta) \lambda_1 r} \leq \frac{\Gamma}{r}, \tag{45}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Gamma := \frac{\lambda_2 \Gamma_2}{\lambda_1} + \frac{\lambda_2 \Gamma_1}{\lambda_3 (1-\theta) \lambda_1}. \tag{46}$$

is a positive constant independent of r . Using the inequality $(a+b)^2 \leq (1+\frac{1}{\mu})a^2 + (1+\mu)b^2$ for any $\mu > 0$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, it is obtained by (10) and (45) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}|x_1(t) - v(t)|^2 \\
&\leq (1 + \frac{1}{\mu}) \mathbb{E}|x_1(t) - v^*(t)|^2 + (1 + \mu) \sigma_1^2 \mathbb{E}|w_1(t)|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{(1 + \frac{1}{\mu}) \Gamma}{r} + (1 + \mu) \sigma_1^2 \gamma_1 \tag{47}
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $t \in [T, \infty)$. Since $\mu > 0$ is arbitrary, it follows from (47) that

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|x_1(t) - v(t)|^2 \leq \sigma_1^2 \gamma_1 \tag{48}$$

uniformly in $t \in [T, \infty)$. In addition, when $\sigma_1 = 0$, it follows from (48) that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|x_1(t) - v(t)|^2 = 0 \tag{49}$$

uniformly in $t \in [T, \infty)$. Thus, for any $\varepsilon := \frac{1}{m^4} > 0$, $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$, there exists an m -dependent constant $r^* = r^*(m)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}|x_1(t) - v(t)|^2 < \frac{1}{m^4} \tag{50}$$

uniformly in $t \in [T, \infty)$ for all $r \geq r^*$. By Chebyshev's inequality ([19, p.5]), it has

$$P \left\{ \omega : |x_1(t) - v(t)| > \frac{1}{m} \right\} \leq \frac{1}{m^2} \tag{51}$$

uniformly in $t \in [T, \infty)$ for all $r \geq r^*$. By Borel-Cantelli's lemma ([19, p.7]), it can be also obtained that for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$, there exists an $m_0 = m_0(\omega)$ such that

$$|x_1(t) - v(t)| \leq \frac{1}{m} \tag{52}$$

uniformly in $t \in [T, \infty)$ whenever $m \geq m_0, r \geq r^*$. Therefore, for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} |x_1(t) - v(t)| \leq \frac{1}{m} \tag{53}$$

whenever $m \geq m_0$. Setting $m \rightarrow \infty$ gives

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} |x_1(t) - v(t)| = 0, \text{ almost surely} \tag{54}$$

uniformly in $t \in [T, \infty)$ when $\sigma_1 = 0$. This completes the proof of the Theorem III.1.

APPENDIX C: Proof of Theorem III.2

By (21) and performing the integration by parts, it can be easily obtained that for each $i = 2, 3, \dots, n$,

$$x_i(\varphi) = (-1)^{(i-1)} \int_0^a x_1(t) \varphi^{(i-1)}(t) dt, \forall \varphi \in C_0^\infty(0, a). \tag{55}$$

From Theorem III.1, (55) and the definition of the generalized derivative in (20), for each $i = 2, 3, \dots, n$ and any $0 < \xi < a$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}|x_i(\varphi) - v^{(i-1)}(\varphi)|^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^a x_i(t) \varphi(t) dt - (-1)^{(i-1)} \int_0^a v(t) \varphi^{(i-1)}(t) dt \right|^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left| \int_0^a (x_1(t) - v(t)) \varphi^{(i-1)}(t) dt \right|^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq a \int_0^a \mathbb{E}|x_1(t) - v(t)|^2 dt \sup_{t \in (0,a)} |\varphi^{(i-1)}(t)|^2 \\
&\leq a \int_0^\xi \mathbb{E}|x_1(t) - v(t)|^2 dt \sup_{t \in (0,a)} |\varphi^{(i-1)}(t)|^2 \\
&+ a \int_\xi^a \mathbb{E}|x_1(t) - v(t)|^2 dt \sup_{t \in (0,a)} |\varphi^{(i-1)}(t)|^2 \\
&\leq \xi a \max_{0 \leq t \leq \xi} \mathbb{E}|x_1(t) - v(t)|^2 \sup_{t \in (0,a)} |\varphi^{(i-1)}(t)|^2 \\
&+ a(a - \xi) \sup_{t \in (0,a)} |\varphi^{(i-1)}(t)|^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{\mu}\right) \frac{\Gamma}{r} \\
&+ (1 + \mu) \sigma_1^2 \gamma_1. \tag{56}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mu > 0$ is arbitrary, passing to the limit as $r \rightarrow \infty$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|x_i(\varphi) - v^{(i-1)}(\varphi)|^2 \\
&\leq \xi a \max_{0 \leq t \leq \xi} \mathbb{E}|x_1(t) - v(t)|^2 \sup_{t \in (0,a)} |\varphi^{(i-1)}(t)|^2 \\
&+ a(a - \xi) \sup_{t \in (0,a)} |\varphi^{(i-1)}(t)|^2 \sigma_1^2 \gamma_1. \tag{57}
\end{aligned}$$

Setting $\xi \rightarrow 0$, we then have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|x_i(\varphi) - v^{(i-1)}(\varphi)|^2 \\
&\leq a^2 \sup_{t \in (0,a)} |\varphi^{(i-1)}(t)|^2 \sigma_1^2 \gamma_1. \tag{58}
\end{aligned}$$

When $\sigma_1 = 0$, it follows from (58) that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}|x_i(\varphi) - v^{(i-1)}(\varphi)|^2 = 0. \tag{59}$$

Similar to (50)-(54), it can be also obtained that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} |x_i(\varphi) - v^{(i-1)}(\varphi)| = 0, \text{ almost surely.} \tag{60}$$

This completes the proof of the Theorem III.2.

REFERENCES

- [1] Han, J.Q. (2009). From PID to active disturbance rejection control. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 56(3), 900-906.
- [2] Han, J.Q., & Wang, W. (1994). Nonlinear tracking-differentiator. *Journal of Systems Science and Mathematical Science*, 14, 177-183 (in Chinese).
- [3] Xue, W.C., Huang, Y., & Yang, X.X. (2010, July). What kinds of system can be used as tracking-differentiator. *In Proceedings of the 29th Chinese Control Conference (pp. 6113-6120)*. IEEE.
- [4] Su, Y.X., Zheng, C.H., Sun, D., & Duan, B.Y. (2005). A simple nonlinear velocity estimator for high-performance motion control. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 52(4), 1161-1169.
- [5] Tian, D.P., Shen, H.H., & Dai, M. (2013). Improving the rapidity of nonlinear tracking differentiator via feedforward. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 61(7), 3736-3743.
- [6] Shen, J., Xin, B., Cui, H.Q., & Gao, W.X. (2017). Control of single-axis rotation INS by tracking differentiator based fuzzy PID. *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, 53(6), 2976-2986.
- [7] Zhang, H.H., Xie, Y.D., Xiao, G.X., Zhai, C., & Long, Z.Q. (2018). A simple discrete-time tracking differentiator and its application to speed and position detection system for a maglev train. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 27(4), 1728-1734.
- [8] Guo, B.Z., Han, J.Q., & Xi, F.B. (2002). Linear tracking-differentiator and application to online estimation of the frequency of a sinusoidal signal with random noise perturbation. *International Journal of Systems Science*, 33(5), 351-358.
- [9] Guo, B.Z., & Zhao, Z.L. (2011). On convergence of tracking differentiator. *International Journal of Control*, 84(4), 693-701.
- [10] Guo, B.Z., & Zhao, Z.L. (2012). Weak convergence of nonlinear high-gain tracking differentiator. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 58(4), 1074-1080.
- [11] Guo, B.Z., & Zhao, Z.L. (2016). *Active Disturbance Rejection Control for Nonlinear Systems: An Introduction*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- [12] Deng, H., & Krstić, M. (1997). Stochastic nonlinear stabilization-I: a backstepping design. *Systems & Control Letters*, 32(3), 143-150.
- [13] Pan, Z., & Basar, T. (1999). Backstepping controller design for nonlinear stochastic systems under a risk-sensitive cost criterion. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 37(3), 957-995.
- [14] Deng, H., & Krstić, M. (1999). Output-feedback stochastic nonlinear stabilization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 44(2), 328-333.
- [15] Zhao, X.Y., & Deng, F.Q. (2022). Time-varying Halanay inequalities with application to stability and control of delayed stochastic systems. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 67(3), 1226-1240.
- [16] Duan, J.Q. (2015). *An introduction to stochastic dynamics (Vol. 51)*. Cambridge University Press.
- [17] Klosek-Dygas, M.M., Matkowsky, B.J., & Schuss, Z. (1988). Colored noise in dynamical systems. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 48(2), 425-441.
- [18] Hänggi, P., & Jung, P. (1995). Colored noise in dynamical systems. *Advances in chemical physics*, 89, 239-326.
- [19] Mao, X.R. (2007). *Stochastic Differential Equations and Applications*. Horwood Publishing Limited, Chichester.
- [20] Texas Instruments, Technical Reference Manual. (2013). TMS320F28069M, TMS320F28068M InstaSPIN™-MOTION Software, Literature Number: SPRUHJ0A. April 2013, Revised November 2013.